

KAMIL STACHOWSKI
Jagiellonian University, Cracow
kamil.stachowski@gmail.com

W. KOTWICZ'S UNPUBLISHED STUDY *LES VOYELLES LONGUES DANS LES LANGUES ALTAÏQUES* (1938)

Keywords: Kotwicz, edition, Altaic, long vowels

Abstract

This paper is an edition of an article by Władysław Kotwicz (1872–1944) entitled *Les voyelles longues dans les langues altaïques*, which the author could not publish himself during wartime and did not live to publish after the War was over. The edition is designed to read almost as if published by Kotwicz, but without falsifying the actual manuscript. Also, a brief archival description is provided and the history of the last four years of the text has been reconstructed, based mostly on Kotwicz's correspondence.

0. Rationale and acknowledgments | 1. Introductory remarks: 1.1. Archival, 1.2. Editorial, 1.3. History of the text, 1.4. References, 1.5. Table of contents | 2. W. Kotwicz, *Les voyelles longues dans les langues altaïques*

0. Rationale and acknowledgments

Before his death in 1944, Władysław Kotwicz composed a list of his unpublished writings, which, he believed, would be of value to future researchers. (Available in full in an English translation in Tulisow (1986: 209–11); see also Stachowski K. 2012) Most of the items have subsequently been published but a few remain unknown to the general public. One of them is a study entitled *Les voyelles longues dans les langues altaïques*. Kotwicz finished it in 1938 and was preparing for publication when news reached him about Lajos Ligeti's paper on long vowels in Turkic, which

appeared that year. He decided to postpone the publication until he could become acquainted with the new article. This did not happen until 1942, when publication was no longer possible.

The purpose of the current paper is to publish the text for Kotwicz, i.e. possibly in the form it would have taken if he had published it himself.

I would like to express my gratitude to (alphabetically): Ewa Dziurzyńska (Archive of Science of Polish Academy of Sciences and Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, Cracow) for her very effective and important help, to Iwona Piechnik (Jagiellonian University, Cracow) for her unwearied helpfulness and diligence, and to all my friends who kindly read and provided insightful comments on this paper. All the remaining flaws are naturally my sole responsibility.

1. Introductory remarks

1.1. Archival

Item K III-19, j.a. 47 in Archiwum Nauki PAN i PAU (Cracow)^a contains three files:

- 1) P = the Polish version of the text: *O samogłoskach długich w językach altajskich* ('On long vowels in the Altaic languages') + a letter from a Hungarian translator^b
- 2) F = the French version of the text: *Les voyelles longues dans les langues altaïques*,
- 3) loose notes.

The **Polish text** consists of 116 rectos, mostly 17.9 × 22.5 cm, not dated. Versos are essentially left blank but there are some, usually short, corrections or insertions on 43 pages. Rectos are numbered in pencil; the numbering is up to 120 and disrupted twice: p. [42] is numbered "42–45" and p. [53] is numbered "56–57".

Determining the exact number of hands (by the end of his life, Kotwicz had weak eyes and dictated most of his writings. – E. Dziurzyńska, p.c.) is impossible, because some corrections are too short – sometimes as short as a single punctuation mark or diacritic – to be assigned with certitude to any author. Three (unidentified) hands dominate, but single pages or shorter insertions on versos are frequently in a few more. Most of the text is in pen; corrections are quite often in pencil, only some of them in Kotwicz's hand.

The Polish text is apparently a previous stage in Kotwicz's work on the subject. This can be deduced from the combination of the following clues, even if (very) rare exceptions exist:

- parts crossed out in P are missing altogether from F,
- parts crossed out in F are not so in P (also, very rarely, missing from P),
- parts inserted in pencil in P are in pen in F,
- parts inserted in pencil in F are missing from P,

^a See Dziurzyńska (1997) for an overview of the entire Oriental collection.

^b See 1.3 for an explanation of the role of Ligeti (1938b).

- F contains fragments missing entirely from P,
- the name of Ligeti appears in F but does not in P (see 1.3 below),
- there are a few *leitfehler* in F (cf. fn. 272/c^a).

Moreover, the Polish text was apparently meant to be translated, and quite probably not by Kotwicz himself:

- very often, names of languages are written in French or the French equivalents are inserted above the Polish forms; e.g. “miś_{ch}erski[...]”^b ‘Misher’ on p. [86],
- it contains single words and even entire phrases in French; e.g.: “quantité” on p. [35], “d’après la nature du discours” on p. [33] etc.,
- there are three of what appear to be mistakes in translation:
 - “językowe” translated as ‘lingual’ rather than ‘linguistic’ (cf. fn. 277/a),
 - “ogólno-turecki[...]” lit. ‘general-Turkic’ = ‘Gemeintürkisch’ rendered as “généralement turc” (cf. fn. 282/b), and
 - the Polish Gen. “Aszmarina” ‘of Ashmarin’s’ misinterpreted as Nom. (cf. fn. 296/c).

The ‘Polish’ file also contains one typewritten page with a few corrections in pen, 15.1 × 25 cm, not dated. The text turns out to be a translation of the final paragraph of Ligeti (1938a), apparently not made by Kotwicz (a footnote: “Ja – tj. tłumacz [...]” = ‘I – i.e. the translator’) and what is more, by a non-Orientalist (“„tarancsi” – to nazwa jakiegoś języka chyba” = “tarancsi” – that’s the name of some language, I think’).

The **French text** consists of 133 rectos, mostly 17.9 × 22.5 cm, not dated. Versos are essentially left blank but there are some, usually short, corrections or insertions on 21 pages. Rectos are numbered in pencil; the numbering is disrupted more than ten times but mostly clear (table 1.).

Ordering in the archive file	Page number on the manuscript	Ordering in the archive file	Page number on the manuscript
[1]	1	[57]	45
[2]	1. ^a	[58–59]	45 ^a –45 ^b
[3–13]	2–12	[60–67]	46–53
[14–16]	2–4	[68]	53 ^a
[17]	13 / 4 ^a	[69–87]	54–72
[18–26]	14–22	[88]	‘To 72’ / 5
[27]	‘supplement to 22’	[89–97]	73–81
[28–49]	23–44	[98]	–
[50–56]	44 ^a –44 ^b	[99]	‘Supplement to p. 81’

^a Footnotes of the second series are referred to as <page>/<footnote> for short.

^b See 1.2.1 for an explanation of symbols.

Ordering in the archive file	Page number on the manuscript	Ordering in the archive file	Page number on the manuscript
[100–18]	82–100	[127]	–
[119]	‘To p. 100’	[128]	7
[120–26]	101–07	[129–33]	108–12

Table 1. Numbering of the manuscript

The number on p. [2] appears to be written quite clearly but the meaning of “1.³” is entirely mysterious to me. The stem of “7” descends distinctly below the baseline of “1” and, in fact, below “1” itself. The full stop can be interpreted as a careless stroke, such as can be seen in all the other “7”s in page numbers throughout the manuscript. It is theoretically possible to view the whole as “17^a” or “1^a” with an inexplicable diagonal line in place of the alleged stem of “7”. The text does not seem to fit after p. 17 (= [21]), however. The second possibility is more plausible: cf. below. The surprisingly low numbers of pp. [14–17], [88] and [128] may be one set of supplements, numbered independently of the main text and inserted at a later time without agreeing the numbering. If so, pp. 1 and 6 are missing. P. 1 might likely be the ambiguous p. [2]. P. 6 could be p. [98] or [127], but just as well some other page, rejected by Kotwicz and unpreserved. Pp. [98] and [99] appear to be in the wrong order in the file. It is, however, of no importance for the text, as the entire p. [99] is a supplement to p. [97]. After moving the text, the remaining ordering seems to be correct. (Cf. fn. 300/a.)

As is the case with the Polish text, determining the exact number of hands is not possible. However, the body text is quite uniformly in one hand (facs. 1), which in all probability belongs to Antonina Gawrońska (1864–1944), the translator of Kotwicz’s texts into French (E. Dziurzyńska, p.c.). Only thirteen pages are entirely in different hands; cf. in particular fn. 279/a. Single corrections and insertions are in at least a few more hands. Most of the text is in pen; corrections are mainly in pencil, only some of them in Kotwicz’s hand (facs. 2). At least one of the corrections was possibly not made by Kotwicz: fn. 307/a.

The **notes file** consists of 51 assorted sheets. Sizes range from mere scraps to a little more than A4 (19.8 × 22 cm; folded in half). Those pages that previously constituted part of the article (see below) are usually one-sided; others are mostly various pieces used as one-sided scribbling paper. Most pages are not numbered; those that are clearly constitute separate sets, not meant to be put together. Again, the exact number of hands cannot be determined. Kotwicz’s hand is relatively frequent. Most pages are generally in pen, but usually with a large number of corrections in pencil. Three types can be distinguished:

- 1) parts of the (Polish version of the) article: mostly lists of examples; very often crossed out and with a large number of corrections in pencil; in the majority of cases contained in the final text, with the corrections applied; clearly fragments of a previous version of the text,

- 2) notes related to the article: more or less loose lists of examples; mostly crossed out; some are unordered excerpts from Radloff (1893–1911) and other, unidentified sources; some are reordered to the format of enumerations used in the article; there are virtually no comments from Kotwicz; versos are quite often unrelated (type 3 below),
- 3) irrelevant: bibliographical notes, an unrelated letter from Tadeusz Lewicki, printing house advertisements (Drukarnia Krajowa in Vilnius and A. Twietmeyer in Leipzig), a March 1937 calendar etc.; most utilized as scribbling paper for type 2 above.

1.2. Editorial

This is only the edition of the French version of the text, which was apparently the one intended for publication (see 1.1. above). The Polish text is only considered where substantive differences appear (different shapes of examples etc., explained in the second series of footnotes) but not when the two versions mismatch because a portion of the text has been crossed out, inserted or reordered in the French version. This is regarded as simply progress in the work on the text. The file with notes (see 1.1.) is ignored altogether.

The intention of this edition is to make available a text that approaches as closely as possible the form that it would have had if it had been published by Kotwicz himself, but without, at the same time, falsifying its actual form. The result is inevitably a compromise, but one that leans towards interpretation rather than a near-facsimile edition:

The manuscript contains a large number of corrections. The great majority of these are clear, and are introduced without notification. The relatively few that are not are described in the second series of footnotes. This refers in particular to the parts marked with question marks in the margin – these are always explained.

Some lines are marked with vertical and horizontal lines (dashes). Unlike those with question marks, these are purely stylistic, terminological or orthographical – i.e. generally technical. Most often, they refer to the insertion of “e” after a century number or to a change of “voyelle double” to “diphtongue”. In a few cases, there are no corrections at all in the appropriate line. These three types are ignored; others are explained in the second series of footnotes.

There are also some additions on separate pages. In all cases but one, the intended place of insertion is explicitly marked; these are considered clear corrections. The one unclear place is explained in fn. 311/a.

There is a relatively small number of technical mistakes and inaccuracies in the manuscript, such as clerical errors, missing italics, obviously missing full stops, commas and brackets, or superfluous commas left over from inaccurately crossed out parts of the text. There are also a few cases of orthographical and/or grammatical errors, mostly where a correction has been made to the sentence but a dependent form has apparently been overlooked. Moreover, the spelling of some proper names

is inconsistent, and some have been left in Polish or in transcription (cf. 1.2.2. below and fn. 279/a). Most of these are corrected without notification in the text but all are listed in 1.2.2 below.

Finally, subsection numbers from subsection [10.] on, contain two mistakes. Both places (subsections [10.] and [30.]) are explained in footnotes. The correct numbers are given in square brackets in place of the original ones.

Overall, all of the emendations are intended to give the text a possibly consistent and correct form while retaining Kotwicz's personal preferences; hence e.g.: "Łaptev" is corrected to "L-", the three spellings for 'Tungus' are standardized but to one with "-o-" ("tongouse"), and "Volga" is kept masculine.

All editorial comments are in the second series of footnotes only, and numbered with letters. At the end of every comment is the location of the relevant portion of the text in the Polish manuscript. These footnotes are referred to as <page>/<footnote> for short. The pagination of the French manuscript is given in the margin so as not to break the flow of reading, with the accuracy to one line of the current edition (page breaks falling within one line are not marked within the text). Insertions from versos are not marked. When an insertion is on another page in the manuscript, numbers "1" and "2" are appended to the number of the split page.

1.2.1. Symbols

[nr.] = page numbers according to the ordering in the files; also corrected subsection numbers,

~~text~~ = *text* crossed out (in the manuscript),

_{text} = *text* inserted (in the manuscript),

†c = illegible text, ca. *c* characters (never forming more than one word),

[_{nr.} text _{nr.}] = fragment commented on in a footnote, referred to by *nr.*; e.g. 265/a,

\ = line break,

¶ = paragraph break,

— = next table column.

1.2.2. Emendations

A few types of emendations have been applied without notification to all the instances throughout the text (listed here in the order of application: cf. "bašk." in 7, and "bur.", "kač." and "kašg." in 7 and 9):

- 1) change of numbering of footnotes to continuous,
- 2) consistent insertion of italics on examples and titles and removal of italics from names of languages,
- 3) standardization to no comma between the cited form and its meaning,
- 4) standardization to no space around the plus sign in "V+C" etc.,
- 5) standardization to the spelling with dashes of "c'est-à-dire" and "quelques-uns", and without dashes of "panturc" (cf. fn. 282/b),

- 6) standardization of “diphtongue” to feminine,
- 7) gallicization of distinctly un-French spellings (cf. in particular fn. 279/a): “al-Kašg.”, “aġar”, “Ašhabad”, “bašk. ~ Bashkir”, “Bouin”, “bur.”, “čag.”, “čern.”, “išim.”, “jark.”, “Ĺaptev”, “kač.”, “Kaġpak”, “karač.”, “kašg.”, “koib.”, “kumand.”, “kumük”, “Kurmyš”, “küär.”, “Potseġuyevski”, “qomul”, “saġar.”, “šor”, “tannou-touwa”, “Tetiüš”, “turf. ~ turfan”, “tüm. ~ tümen”, “ujg.”,
- 8) standardization of inconsistently spelt proper names to the most frequent French form (here in *italics*): *altaï*, *altaï*, *altaï* | *baġk.*, *balk.*, *balkar*, *balkar*. | *čuwaš*, *čuwaš*, *tchouvache*, *tchouv*. | *jak.*, *yakout.*, *yakoute* | *kar.*^a | *kipč.*, *kipčak*, *kipčax*, *Kiptchak*^b | *michär*, *mišär* | *phags-pa*, *phags-pa* | *Melioranski*, *Mélioranski* | *ourianghaï*, *ouriangkhaï*, *uriangkhaï* | *ousbek*, *usbek*, *usbèque*, *uzbek*, *özb.*^c | *Titov*, *Titóv* | *tongous*, *tongouse*, *tung.* | *touba*, *tuba*^d | *turcmène*, *turkmène* | *Vasilevič*, *Vasilevitch*, *Wasilevitch*^e | *Vladimirtsoff*, *Vladimirtsov*, *Vlodimirtsov*,
- 9) standardization of abbreviations to the most frequent form (here in *italics*): *bour.*, *bouriat*. | *kachg.*, *kachgar*. | *katch.*, *katchin*. | *sari-yog.*, *sari-yogur*. | *tchern.*, *tchernev*. | *yark.*, *yarkend.*^f,
- 10) typographical standardization of tables to the most frequent layout (capitalization in headers, synchronization of column widths across tables).

Apart from the above, the following corrections have been made and are not marked in the text unless a wider commentary is required (table 2.).

Location / Manuscript with context	Emendation
fns. 14, 26, 28, 42, 48, 49, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 65, 67, 73, 80, 81, 83, 86, 97, 98, 107, 108, 110, 113, 114, 129, 132	inserted full stop at the end of the footnote
[4] d'une „langue solaire”. En Russie	«langue solaire»
[7] réaliser leurs „grandes” idées; seulement	«grandes»

^a The abbreviations of the names of Karaim dialects show a great diversity, exhausting most of the possible combinations of “kar”, full stops and space or lack thereof, and revealing no preferred form. Of seventeen occurrences altogether, only two are in Kotwicz's hand; they are both “karL.” (for ‘Luck = SW Karaim’), and this is the variant eventually used here.

^b Technically, the most frequent form is “kipč.” with eight occurrences against one occurrence of “kipčak”, “kipčax” and “Kiptchak”. However, it only appears as an abbreviation and seven of the eight instances are in the “Polish” examples (cf. fn. 279/a). The form eventually used here is “kiptchak” with “-k”, which is more frequent than “-x”, and with “-č-” changed to “-tch-” with the purpose of standardization of the text as a whole (cf. 7 above). Cf. fn. 251/c.

^c Similarly to “kiptchak” (fn. 251/b “özb.” is by far the most frequent form (one occurrence of “ousbek”, “usbek” and “uzbek”, and two of “usbèque” against seventeen of “özb.”) but fifteen of its occurrences are in the “Polish” examples (cf. fn. 279/a).

^d There is only one occurrence of “touba” against three of “tuba” but two of them are in the “Polish” examples (cf. fn. 279/a), resulting in fact in a draw, and the French shape is “touba”.

^e Each spelling only appears once. “Vasilevitch” combines the “V-” and “-tch” which are both the most frequent variants, and is in accordance with the French tradition of latinization.

^f Each spelling only appears once. However, “yarkend.” is not in fact an abbreviation in French.

	Location / Manuscript with context	Emendation
[13]	siècle précédent), utilisant l'écriture ouïgoure modifiée, des textes	précédent) utilisant [...] modifiée,
[15]	de la certifier. Dans certains	certifier
[19]	les consonnes même qui ont	mêmes
[20]	consonnes labiales, comme dans la langue dahour, (p. ex. <i>dabusun</i> , <i>xabur</i>) elles sont	labiales (p.
[22 ^v]	<i>g</i> ou <i>j</i> , mais (non pas <i>m</i>)	<i>j</i> (non
[24]	<i>ije</i> etc.) En transcription	etc.). En
[26]	ette [a] règle précité. Les groupes	précitée
[27]	une explication [sure] historique ou	sûre
[28]	M. Ramstedt, „gleichwertig” ⁷¹ ; dans	« gleichwertig »
[32]	<i>abaya</i> , <i>žigasun</i> ⁷¹)	<i>žigasun</i>)
[37]	<i>išgōdūr</i> < <i>üčügöldūr</i> ⁷¹)	<i>üčügöldūr</i> ³¹ .
[43]	<i>xanlāran</i> , ve [i] <i>rgenēsen</i> ⁷²)	<i>irgenēsen</i> ⁴⁷ .
[45]	mongolistes (Pope, Ligeti, les [fennistes]	Ligeti)
[50]	alt. tel. <i>ūs</i> kara-kirg. <i>ōz</i>	<i>ūs</i> ,
[58]	formes de contraction , [contractées], l'une avec	contractées,
[71]	Formes possessives:	possessives
[71]	Datif.	Datif
[72]	Gerundium perfecti [Gérondif parfait].	parfait
[73]	taranč. — <i>qal</i> — ‘rester’	tarantchi
[74]	bouriat, et autres: 18. Dans	autres.
[77]	Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen	Gelehrte [twice]
[77]	par M. W. Bogoroditski. Dans un	V.
[78]	Panturc. — Kazan. — Sibér. occid.	Panturc — Kazan
[79]	<i>aldīlar</i> , <i>etī</i> (< <i>atī</i>) ⁷³)	<i>atī</i>).
[79]	K. Sz XV, 168–164.	K. Sz.
[79]	<i>Götting. gel. Anz.</i> , 1934, 365–366.	<i>Gel.</i>
[82]	les larges [ouvertes] – descendantes ⁷⁴)	descendantes ⁹⁶ .
[83]	langue des Ouriangkhaï, parmi les 9 [ceux]	Ouriangkhaïs
[84]	les dialectes yakout et michär	yakoute

	Location / Manuscript with context	Emendation
[90]	turkm. — — yakout. — tchouv.	Yakoute
[90]	<i>dabayan</i> ‘col (de mont.)’	mont.)’
[91]	turkm. — — yakout. — tchouv.	Yakoute
[91]	<i>xana, köke, ot-</i> , semble #3 constituer	<i>ot-</i>)
[93]	une revue succincte de ces	succincte
[93]	turc. — tchouvache.	turc — tchouvache
[96]	(malsain) <i>sivmar</i>	‘malsain’
[96]	<i>uszav — oszo, oszu</i>	<i>ušav — ošo, ošu</i>
[97]	se sont reflétés de multiples façons	reflétés
[104]	M. Räsänen, <i>Über die langen</i>	<i>Über</i>
[105]	d’emprunts perses [persan] et même	persans
[113]	mongoles et tongouse. Elle a	tongouses
[115]	<i>suox, suot, biäs, tša.</i>	<i>biäs.</i>
[118]	<i>toh, tow, ma-tuwa</i> , kindigir	<i>tow</i> , kindigir
[123]	dans des groupe de tribus	groupes
[125]	<i>Маньчжурско-Русский Словарь</i>	<i>русский словарь</i>
[125]	Н. Захаровъ, <i>Полный Маньчжурско-Русский Словарь</i>	И. [...] <i>маньчжурско-русский словарь</i>
[125 ^v]	<i>Dictionnaire tartare-mantchou français</i>	<i>mantchou-français</i>
[125 ^v]	<i>tonome</i> (ma. <i>tome</i>) M. Ramstedt	<i>tome</i>).
[127]	mots turcs, [possédant des voyelles] pourvus de	pourvues
[128]	mais postérieure au moment où ils [après] que le tchouvache	après
[131]	<i>Материалы для исследования тунгусского языка</i>	<i>исследования тунгусского</i>

Table 2. Emendations not marked in the edition

1.3. History of the text

The reason why Kotwicz – see 1.4 for biographical information – did not publish his article himself is a combination of bad luck and, in fact, diligence.

The question of long vowels appeared in Kotwicz’s work at least as early as June 1929, when he delivered a paper on Mongolian long vowels at the Third

Linguistic Congress in Warsaw. This text was not published and its contents can only be guessed, based on a short note in *BPTJ* 1929: 143:

4. Wł. Kotwicz (Lwów): Samogłoski długie w języku mongolskim.

Z porównania średniowiecznych transkrypcyj tybetańskiej, arabskiej, chińskiej i szczepu Moguł w Afganistanie wynika, że te długie powstały po zniknięciu między samogłoskami spółgłoski gardłowej, wargowej lub *j*. Analogie germańskie i romańskie.^a

It might be suspected that the material then presented, together with the conclusions, formed part of the article published here. Its first final version was ready in 1938. Originally, Kotwicz assigned it to *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* but had to withdraw the idea because of the size of the article. From a postcard to Tadeusz Kowalski dated 23 August 1938:^b

Ukończyłem obecnie artykuł o samogłoskach długich w językach altajskich. Chciałem go umieścić w RO XIV, ale wypadł on cokolwiek za długi: zajmie około 4 ark. druku. Nie wiem, co mam z nim począć. Otóż chciałbym przede wszystkim^c poinformować się, jak stoi sprawa u Pana z „Pracami”: czy mógłby Pan przyjąć moją rzecz do druku i kiedy mogłaby się ukazać?^d

Unfortunately, Kowalski's reply seems to be lost. However, according to a note on the postcard, it reached Kotwicz three days later and, apparently, it was positive.

The finishing editorial work took Kotwicz longer than he had expected and in a postcard to Kowalski of 20 September 1938, he informed him that he might not be able to finish it before 1 October. Again, Kowalski's reply seems to be unavailable, but according to a note on the postcard, it arrived as early as the next day (the route was from Czarny Bór (now Juodšiliai) near Vilnius to Kościelisko near Zakopane in southern Poland) and must have contained information about Ligeti (1938a). In his reply of 24 September, Kotwicz wrote:

^a '4. Wł. Kotwicz (Lviv): Long vowels in Mongolian.

From a comparison of medieval transcriptions: Tibetan, Arabic, Chinese and that of the Moghul tribe in Afghanistan, it follows that the long ones arose after a guttural or labial consonant, or *j* had disappeared between vowels. Germanic and Romance analogies.'

[All translations are mine – K.S.]

^b All the letters quoted here are archived in Archiwum Nauki PAN i PAU (Cracow) under the following signatures:

- Kotwicz to Kowalski: K III-4, j.a. 166;
- Kotwicz to Ligeti: K III-19, j.a. 152;
- Kowalski to Kotwicz: K III-19, j.a. 153.

^c The letters are, like the manuscripts, not written by Kotwicz himself except for the signatures. I failed to identify the hands. Here apparently, the scribe was one of the many who were reluctant to accept the 1936 orthography reform in full. Cf. e.g. Polański 2004: 36, 38 and 40.

^d 'I have presently finished my article on long vowels in the Altaic languages. I wanted to place it in RO XIV but it happened somewhat too long: it will take about four quires. I do not know what I shall do with it. In the first place, I would like to ask: could you accept my paper for printing and when could it appear?'

Wiadomość o artykule p. Ligeti'ego bardzo mię zainteresowała. Trzeba byłoby zapoznać się z nim choć pobieżnie, przed oddaniem do druku mojej pracy. Niestety „Magyar” Nyelv [sic] w Polsce, zdaje się, nikt nie otrzymuje. Czy nie mógłbym prosić Pana, po otrzymaniu odbitki, udzielić mi jej na jakiś czas? Obawiam się tylko, aby w dzisiejszych warunkach odbitka gdzieś się nie zawieruszyła.^a

Eventually, Kotwicz received the offprint (perhaps shortly) before 18 November and did not find it particularly important for his work. From a letter to Kowalski from 12 December:

O ile mogłem się zorientować, dochodzimy z autorem prawie do tych samych wyników w tej sprawie, którą on porusza (ja rozważam rzecz szerzej); mogę więc ograniczyć się do kilku cytatów.^b

A similar opinion is expressed in Kotwicz's letter to Ligeti of 24 December 1938. However, Kotwicz must have learned that Ligeti planned to soon publish a French translation of his paper, and to extend it by one chapter. Thus, Kotwicz decided to withhold printing until this new version was available to him.

The waiting turned out to be much longer than anyone could have expected. Only as late as September 1942, could Kowalski send Kotwicz a short summary of the added chapter. It might be interesting to note that it was accompanied by Kowalski's brief opinion of the work. From Kowalski's letter of 31 August 1942:

Jest on napisany dość chaotycznie, tak że streszczenie dokładne nie jest rzeczą łatwą. [...] Nie porównywałem tekstu francuskiego z węgierskim, może oryginał był napisany jaśniej i konsekwentniej. Wersja francuska jest pełna skoków myślowych, tak że trudno nieraz iść za myślą autora.^c

Thus, Kotwicz deferred the publication of his article for four years to wait for a summary of one chapter of an essentially insignificant paper. As it happened, this rendered the publication altogether impossible. The story is briefly recapitulated by Kotwicz himself in *Studia nad językami altajskimi*, another of his posthumously published works (= Kotwicz (1953: 2f); also available in Russian in Kotwicz (1962: 20f)).

Dating the study is quite speculative. Manuscripts are not dated, and the more so, neither are any corrections. The latest date appearing in the text is 1938. However,

^a 'The information about Mr. Ligeti's article interested me very much. I should acquaint myself with it, albeit briefly, before submitting my paper for print. Unfortunately, it seems that no one in Poland receives "Magyar" Nyelv [sic]. May I ask you to grant me the offprint for some time, after you receive it? I only fear that it does not get mislaid somewhere, in today's conditions.'

^b 'As far as I could figure out, we reach almost the same results as the author in the matter that he raises (I consider it wider); so I can limit myself to a few citations.'

^c 'It is written in quite a chaotic way, so that a precise summary is not an easy thing to make. [...] I did not compare the French text with the Hungarian one – maybe the original was written more clearly and consistently. The French version is full of mental leaps, so many a time it is difficult to follow the author's thought.'

during wartime, the publication and distribution of militarily useless scholarly papers tends to be slow, if it occurs at all. Kotwicz died in 1944. Ligeti (1938a) probably became available to him in November 1938 (see above); Ligeti (1938b) only in September 1942. However, I could find no reason necessarily to date any of the references to Ligeti later than 1938. Overall, there are nine: five consist of only the name, two are short mentions (four and seven words), one is longer and substantive (p. [88]) and one is longer but is not substantive (p. [2]).

The decisive majority of the corrections are of stylistic or transcriptional nature and reveal no clue as to the time of their introduction. It is known that Kotwicz considered the text almost ready in 1938. I believe that it can be safely assumed that the bulk of the substantive text dates from that year, and that the changes potentially introduced during the following six years until Kotwicz's death are of very little importance to the essence.

14. References

- BPTJ 1929 = Trzeci zjazd językoznawczy w Warszawie 29 i 30 czerwca 1928. – *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 2 (1929): 130–143.
- Dziurzyńska E. 1997. Sources for the History of Oriental Studies in Poland in the Collections of the Cracow Branch of the Archives of the Polish Academy of Sciences. – *Folia Orientalia* 33: 49–57.
- Kałużynski S. 1972. Władysław Kotwicz (na stulecie urodzin). – *Przegląd Orientalistyczny* 2(82): 103–114.
- Kotwicz W. 1953. Studia nad językami altajskimi. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 16 (1950, ed. 1953) [Festschrift W. Kotwicz]: 1–314.
- Kotwicz 1962 = Kotvič V. 1962. *Issledovanie po altajskim jazykam* [transl. from Polish by A.I. Tolkačev]. Moskva 1962.
- Kotwiczówna M. 1953. Bibliografia Władysława Kotwicza. – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 16 (1950, ed. 1953) [Festschrift W. Kotwicz]: xxxi–xlvi.
- Lewicki M. 1953. Władysław Kotwicz (20.III.1872 – 3.X.1944). – *Rocznik Orientalistyczny* 16 (1950, ed. 1953) [Festschrift W. Kotwicz]: xi–xxix.
- Lewicki M. 1957. Władysław Kotwicz (20.III.1872 – 3.X.1944). – Strelcyn S. (ed.) *Szkice z dziejów polskiej orientalistyki*. Warszawa: 7–30.
- Ligeti L. 1938a. A török hosszú magánhangzók. – *Magyar Nyelv* 34: 65–76.
- Ligeti L. 1938b. Les voyelles longues en turc. – *Journal Asiatique* 230 (avril–juin): 177–204.
- Polański E. 2004. Reformy ortografii polskiej – wczoraj, dziś, jutro. – *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 60: 29–46.
- Radloff V.V. 1893–1911. *Opyt' slovarja tjurkskih" naręčij. Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte*. Sanktpeterburg".
- Rozwadowski J. 1916. O zjawiskach w rozwoju języka. 6. O rozwoju fonetycznym. – *Język Polski* 3/2–3: 33–47.
- Rozwadowski J. 1960. *Wybór pism, 3: Językoznawstwo ogólne*. Warszawa 1960.
- Stachowski K. 2012. Władysława Kotwicza niepublikowany *Rzut oka na losy orientalistyki w Polsce* (1938). – *LingVaria* 14: 207–238.
- Tulisow J. 1986. Władysław Kotwicz. – *Hemispheres* 2: 199–215.
- Zajączkowski A. 1968–1969. Kotwicz Władysław. – Rostworowski E. et al. (eds.) *Polski Słownik biograficzny* 14. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: 507–508.

1.5. Table of contents

Sections and subsections in the manuscript are numbered but not named. For better guidance, I give my own titles below.

I Introduction

1. Introductory notes	259
2. Sources	259

II Mongolic

3. State of the art	261
4. Classical Mongolian	263
5. Contraction – the first phase	267
6. Creation of long vowels	268
7. Inflection	270
8. Contraction – the second phase	270
9. Compensatory lengthening and other factors	271
[10.] Diphthongization	274
[11.] Loss of length	275

III Standard Turkic

[12.] State of the art	276
[13.] The younger layer of long vowels	277
[14.] Contraction – medial consonants	281
[15.] Contraction – final consonants	282
[16.] Contraction – mixed type	283
[17.] Parallel forms	284
[18.] Inflection	284
[19.] Suffixes in <i>-γ ~ -g</i>	287
[20.] Compensatory lengthening	288
[21.] Combinatorial lengthening	289
[22.] Loanwords	290
[23.] Diphthongization	290
[24.] Loss of length	291
[25.] The ancient layer of long vowels	291
[26.] External evidence	293

IV Chuvash, Turkmen, Tuvinian and Yakut

[27.] Introductory notes	296
[28.] Chuvash	296
[29.] Chuvash vs. Standard Turkic	300
[30.] Turkmen	302
[31.] Tuvinian	303
[32.] Yakut – introductory notes	304

[33.] Yakut – development of length	305
[34.] Yakut – diphthongization	306

V Manchu-Tungusic

[35.] Tungusic	307
[36.] Manchu	309

VI Conclusions

[37.] Summary and conclusions	311
[38.] Closing notes	312

Note

Too late for inclusion in the above, I was informed about the change of shelf numbers and page numbering of the manuscripts. The Polish text is now archived as K III-19, 36, the French text as K III-19, 37, and versos are numbered so that p. [65^v] in fig. 2 is now p. 130.

☞ The following parts (pages 259–316) are on the attached CD.